

Case No: 13-55631

Joseph La Costa  
California Bar #108443  
7840 Mission Center Court, Suite #104  
San Diego, California 92108  
619 922-5287  
joelacostaesq@gmail.com  
Attorney for Plaintiff/Appellant, Chester M. Hunt. Lynda Susan Hunt

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

CHESTER M. HUNT, LYNDASUSAN HUNT,	) Case No: 13-55631
	)
Plaintiff/Appellant,	) D.C. No: EDCV-12-02171 TJH (OPx)
	)
	)
vs.	) BRIEF OF APPELLANT
	)
	)
	)
U.S. BANK, NATIONAL	)
ASSOCIATION, AS TRUSTEE FOR	)
THE HOLDERS OF MASTR	)
ADJUSTABLE RATE MORTGAGES	)
TRUST 2007-3; BANK OF	)
AMERICA, N.A.SUCCESSOR BY	)
MERGER TO BAC HOME LOANS	)
SERVICING, LP FKA	)
COUNTRYWIDE HOME LOANS	)
SERVICING LP; DOES 1 THROUGH	)
10, INCLUSIVE	)
	)
	)
Defendants/Appellee.	)
	)

Case No: 13-55631

1 Plaintiffs/Appellants CHESTER M. HUNT, LYNDIA SUSAN HUNT  
2 respectfully appeal from the Judgment and Order Granting Defendant's Motion  
3 to dismiss Plaintiff/Appellants complaint without leave to amend.  
4

5 Date: October 22, 2013  
6

7 /s/ Joseph La Costa  
8

9 \_\_\_\_\_  
10 Joseph La Costa  
11 Attorney for CHESTER M. HUNT, LYNDIA SUSAN HUNT  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE
-------------------	------

1	Table of Authorities	ii
2	I. <u>JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT</u>	1
3	a. Jurisdiction of the Federal District Court, Southern	
4	District.	1
5	b. Jurisdiction of the 9 <sup>th</sup> Circuit Court of Appeals.	2
6	c. Timeliness of the Appeal.	2
7	d. The finality of the order appealed.	2
8	II. <u>STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES PRESENTED FOR</u>	
9	<u>REVIEW</u>	5
10	III. <u>STATEMENT OF THE CASE</u>	5
11	a. Nature of the case.	5
12	b. Course of proceedings.	5
13	c. Disposition at the Federal District Court below.	6
14	IV. <u>STATEMENT OF FACTS RELEVANT TO THE ISSUES</u>	
15	<u>SUBMITTED FOR REVIEW</u>	6
16	V. <u>SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT</u>	7
17	VI. <u>ARGUMENT.</u>	7
18	a. Contentions and reasons for them with citations to the	
19	authorities and parts of the record relied upon.	7
20	b. Standard of Review.	8
21	VII. <u>CONCLUSION</u>	8
22	<u>STATEMENT OF RELATED CASES</u>	9
23	<u>CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE</u>	11
24	<u>CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE</u>	12

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES****PAGE****CASES**

AE ex rel. Hernandez v. County of Tulare

666 F.3d 631 (9th Cir. 2012)

8

Bagdasarian Prods., LLC v. Twentieth Century Fox Film Corp.

673 F.3d 1267 (9th Cir. 2012)

3

Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Alabama v. Unity Outpatient

Surgery Center, Inc.

490 F.3d 718 (9th Cir. 2007)

3

Coopers &amp; Lybrand v. Livesay

437 U.S. 463 (1978)

2

Elliott v. White Mountain Apache Tribal Court

566 F.3d 842 (9th Cir. 2009)

3

Firestone Tire &amp; Rubber Co. v. Risjord

449 U.S. 368 (1981)

2

Glaski v. Bank of America

F064556, 2013 WL 4037310 (Cal. App. 5th Dist. 2013)

7, 8

Hotel &amp; Motel Ass'n of Oakland v. City of Oakland

344 F.3d 959 (9th Cir. 2003)

4

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES****PAGE**

Jewel v. Nat'l Sec. Agency

673 F.3d 902 (9th Cir. 2011)

8

Klestadt & Winters, LLP v. Cangelosi

672 F.3d 809 (9th Cir. 2012) (bankruptcy)

3

Moses H. Cone Mem'l Hosp. v. Mercury Constr. Corp.

460 U.S. 1 (1983)

3

Stone v. Heckler

722 F.2d 464 (9th Cir. 1983)

3

Sierra Forest Legacy v. Sherman

646 F.3d 1161 (9th Cir. 2011)

3

Nat'l Distrib. Agency v. Nationwide Mut. Ins. Co.

117 F.3d 432 (9th Cir. 1997)

3

Slimick v. Silva (In re Slimick)

928 F.2d 304 (9th Cir. 1990)

4

Lovell v. Chandler

303 F.3d 1039 (9th Cir. 2002)

4.

Montes v. United States

37 F.3d 1347 (9th Cir. 1994)

4

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES****PAGE**

Oki Semiconductor Co. v. Wells Fargo Bank  
298 F.3d 768 (9th Cir. 2002)

8

Scott v. Eversole Mortuary  
522 F.2d 1110 (9th Cir. 1975)

4

Smith v. Pacific Props. & Dev. Corp.  
358 F.3d 1097 (9th Cir. 2004)

8

Thinket Ink Info Res., Inc. v. Sun Microsystems, Inc.  
368 F.3d 1053 (9th Cir. 2004)

8

**OTHER AUTHORITIES**

Article III of the United States Constitution

1

12 U.S.C. § 2605

1

15 U.S.C. §1692

1

28 U.S.C. §1331

1

28 U.S. C. §1367

1

28 U.S.C. §1332

1

28 U.S.C. §1391(b)

1

28 U.S.C. §1343

1

28 U.S.C. §1291

2

28 U.S.C. §2107

2

28 U.S.C. §2201

1

28 U.S.C. §2202

1

42 U.S.C. §1983

1

## **I. JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT**

### **a. Jurisdiction of the Federal District Court, Southern District.**

The Federal District Court had original jurisdiction over the claims in this action based on 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343, 2201, 2202, 12 U.S.C. § 2605, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, 42 U.S.C. § 1983 which confer original jurisdiction on federal district courts in suits to address the deprivation of rights secured by federal law.

The Federal District Court also had supplemental jurisdiction over the pendant state law claims because they form a part of the same case or controversy under Article III of the United States Constitution, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

The Federal District Court had original jurisdiction over the claims in this action based on 28 U.S.C. § 1332, which confers original jurisdiction on federal district courts in suits between diverse citizens that involve an amount in controversy in excess of \$75,000.00

The unlawful conduct, illegal practices, and acts complained of and alleged in the Plaintiff/Appellant's complaint were all committed in the Central District of California and involved real property located in the Central District of California. Therefore, venue properly lied in the Central District, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).

Plaintiffs/Appellants, Chester and Lynda Hunt ("HUNT" hereafter) are now, and at all times mentioned herein were, individuals residing in the State of California, County of Riverside, City of Riverside. At all relevant times to this action, Plaintiffs/Appellants have owned that real property which is the subject matter of these proceedings which is located within the jurisdiction of the Central District of California.

1 At all relevant times Defendant/Appellee U.S. Bank, National  
2 Association is a National Association organized and existing under the laws of  
3 the State of Minnesota.

4 At all relevant times Defendant/Appellee Bank of America, National  
5 Association is a National Association organized and existing under the laws of  
6 the State of North Carolina.

7 Hereafter, Defendants will be collectively referred to as “Defendants”  
8 and/or “USBNA.”

9  
10 **b. Jurisdiction of the 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court of Appeals.**

11 The 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court of Appeals has jurisdiction of this matter pursuant  
12 to 28 U.S.C. § 1291.

13  
14 **c. Timeliness of the Appeal.**

15 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2107 no appeal shall bring any judgment, order  
16 or decree in an action, suit or proceeding of a civil nature before a court of  
17 appeals for review unless notice of appeal is filed, within thirty days after the  
18 entry of such judgment, order or decree.

19 The Judgment that is the subject of this appeal was entered on April 3,  
20 2013.

21 The Plaintiff/Appellant filed their Notice of Appeal on April 16, 2013,  
22 thirteen days later.

23 Since the Notice of Appeal was filed within 30 days of the entry of  
24 judgment, this appeal is timely.

25  
26 **d. The finality of the order appealed.**

27 Under 28 U.S.C. § 1291, the court of appeals has jurisdiction over “all  
28 final decisions of the district courts . . . except where a direct review may be



1 had in the Supreme Court.” *Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. v. Risjord*, 449 U.S.  
2 368, 373 (1981).

3 Section 1291 has been interpreted to confer appellate jurisdiction over a  
4 district court decision that “ends the litigation on the merits and leaves nothing  
5 for the court to do but execute the judgment.” *Coopers & Lybrand v. Livesay*,  
6 437 U.S. 463, 467 (1978) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted); see  
7 also *Klestadt & Winters, LLP v. Cangelosi*, 672 F.3d 809, 813 (9th Cir. 2012)  
8 (bankruptcy).

9 A district court decision may also be considered final where its result is  
10 that the appellant is “effectively out of court.” *Moses H. Cone Mem’l Hosp. v.*  
11 *Mercury Constr. Corp.*, 460 U.S. 1, 9 (1983) (citations omitted); see also  
12 *Bagdasarian Prods., LLC v. Twentieth Century Fox Film Corp.*, 673 F.3d  
13 1267, 1270-71 (9th Cir. 2012) (recognizing that “courts will in limited  
14 circumstances permit immediate appeal if the stay order effectively puts the  
15 plaintiff ‘out of court’—creating a substantial possibility there will be no  
16 further proceedings in the federal forum, because a parallel proceeding might  
17 either moot the action or become res judicata on the operative question”); *Blue*  
18 *Cross and Blue Shield of Alabama v. Unity Outpatient Surgery Center, Inc.*,  
19 490 F.3d 718, 723-24 (9th Cir. 2007) (stating that “Moses H. Cone applies  
20 whenever there is a possibility that proceedings in another court could moot a  
21 suit or an issue, even if there is no guarantee that they will do so” and holding  
22 that “lengthy and indefinite stays place a plaintiff effectively out of court.”).

23 The finality rule is to be given a “practical rather than a technical  
24 construction.” *Stone v. Heckler*, 722 F.2d 464, 467 (9th Cir. 1983) (quotation  
25 marks and citation omitted); see also *Sierra Forest Legacy v. Sherman*, 646  
26 F.3d 1161, 1175 (9th Cir. 2011) (applying practical construction to the finality  
27 requirement to determine if remand order was final); *Elliott v. White Mountain*  
28

1 *Apache Tribal Court*, 566 F.3d 842, 845 (9th Cir. 2009) (“[T]he requirement of  
2 finality is to be given a practical rather than a technical construction.”  
3 (quotation marks and citation omitted)).

4 A district court order is final only when it is clear that the judge intended  
5 it to be final. See *Nat’l Distrib. Agency v. Nationwide Mut. Ins. Co.*, 117 F.3d  
6 432, 433 (9th Cir. 1997). “Evidence of intent consists of the [o]rder’s content  
7 and the judge’s and parties[’] conduct.” *Slimick v. Silva (In re Slimick)*, 928  
8 F.2d 304, 308 (9th Cir. 1990) (citations omitted); see also *Hotel & Motel Ass’n*  
9 *of Oakland v. City of Oakland*, 344 F.3d 959, 964 (9th Cir. 2003) (concluding,  
10 based on the procedural history leading up to order, that the district court  
11 intended order to be final even though some of the claims were dismissed  
12 without prejudice). The focus is on the intended effect of the order, not the  
13 terminology used by the district court. See *Montes v. United States*, 37 F.3d  
14 1347, 1350 (9th Cir. 1994) (holding that order dismissing “action” rather than  
15 “complaint” is not final if court’s words and actions indicate an intent to grant  
16 plaintiff leave to amend). If it is clear that the district court intended to dispose  
17 of all the claims before it, abandoned claims will not compromise the finality  
18 of the judgment. See *Lovell v. Chandler*, 303 F.3d 1039, 1049 (9th Cir. 2002).

19 Where the district court expressly denies leave to amend, the order is  
20 final and appealable. See *Scott v. Eversole Mortuary*, 522 F.2d 1110, 1112 (9th  
21 Cir. 1975).

22 The Judgment and Order Granting Defendant’s Motion to dismiss  
23 Plaintiffs/Appellants complaint without leave to amend, served to terminate  
24 and close the pending cause of action, and permitted Plaintiffs/Appellants no  
25 further right to pursue their case.

26 Accordingly, the order appealed from is final.  
27  
28

## **II. STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW.**

The issues presented on appeal are relative to the Order granting the Defendant/Appellee's Motion to Dismiss the Plaintiffs/Appellant's Complaint without leave to amend. The Plaintiffs/Appellants assert that the subject order was improper and an abuse of the Court's discretion, and therefore subject to review and reversal by this Court on Appeal.

## **III. STATEMENT OF THE CASE.**

### **a. Nature of the case.**

The Plaintiffs/Appellants have filed this action relative to their personal residence in the City of Riverside, California in the County of Riverside, and the claims asserted by the Defendant/Appellee's. HUNT asserted that USBNA was a third party stranger to the loan transaction that was secured by the subject property, and that the actions taken by USBNA relative to the asserted interest in the loan transaction were non-existent. Given the lack of any pecuniary or contractual interest in the loan transaction, HUNT sought to establish the relative interests of USBNA in the Note and Deed of Trust that secures the property through their claim for Declaratory Relief; recover damages for moneys wrongfully obtained by USBNA and obtain an accounting of the moneys improperly obtained by USBNA.

### **b. Course of proceedings.**

HUNT filed this pending action on December 11, 2012 after prior proceedings were terminated with the Federal District Court for the Central District. (See Excerpts of Record, Volume 1, Number 1, Documents #1.)

1 On January 18, 2013, USBNA filed a Motion to Dismiss with the Court.  
2 (See Excerpts of Record Volume 1, Number 2, Documents #13.)

3 On February 1, 2013 HUNT filed an Opposition to the Motion to  
4 Dismiss. (See Excerpts of Record, Volume 2, Number 12, Document #19.)

5 On February 11, 2013 USBNA filed a Reply to HUNT's opposition to  
6 Defendant's Motion to Dismiss. (See Excerpts of Record Volume 2, Number  
7 13, Document #21.)

8  
9 **c. Disposition at the Federal District Court below.**

10 On April 3, 2013 the District Court issued and entered its Order on  
11 Motion to Dismiss. Leave to amend was not granted. (See Excerpts of Record  
12 Volume 2, Number 14, Documents #22.)

13 On April 3, 2013 the Clerk filed its Judgment dismissing the case, and  
14 said order was entered on April 3, 2013. (See Excerpts of Record, Volume 2,  
15 Number 15, Document #23.)

16 On April 16, 2013 HUNT filed their Notice of Appeal to the Ninth  
17 Circuit Court of Appeal. (See Excerpts of Record Volume 2, Number 16,  
18 Document #24.)

19  
20 **IV. STATEMENT OF FACTS RELEVANT TO THE ISSUES**  
21 **SUBMITTED FOR REVIEW.**  
22

23 Because a reasonable analysis of the Plaintiff's complaint, as set forth in  
24 HUNT's opposition to the Defendant's Motion to Dismiss shows that further  
25 amendment can save the Plaintiff's claims, as well as the recent decision by the  
26 California Court of Appeal in *Glaski v. Bank of America*, F064556, 2013 WL  
27 4037310 (Cal. App. 5th Dist. 2013) setting forth a borrowers standing to  
28 question the method, timeliness of and legality of the securitization process,

1 the Plaintiff's complaint could be saved by amendment and therefore HUNT  
2 files this appeal seeking *de novo* review of the dismissal of their case.

3  
4 **V. SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT.**

5  
6 HUNT has filed the present appeal because the Federal District Court  
7 abused its discretion in dismissing the pending case without permitting HUNT  
8 leave to amend, especially in light of recent case law.

9 Since the District Court has dismissed the case without leave to amend,  
10 on appeal this Court reviews the Motion to Dismiss filed by USBNA in a *de*  
11 *novo* manner.

12  
13 **VI. ARGUMENT.**

14  
15 **a. Contentions and reasons for them with citations to the**  
16 **authorities and parts of the record relied upon.**

17 The Court below issued an Order granting USBNA's motion to dismiss  
18 without leave to amend.

19 HUNT contends their complaint and causes of action CAN be saved by  
20 further amendment. In support thereof HUNT contends that upon *de novo*  
21 review of the order of dismissal together with review of HUNT's complaint  
22 and HUNT's opposition to the USBNA Motion to Dismiss this Court will  
23 conclude that HUNT's complaint can be saved by further amendment, and  
24 therefore the Court below erred in denying HUNT the opportunity to amend  
25 the complaint.

26 While the Defendant takes great issue with HUNT's arguments relative  
27 to the failed securitization of the Note and Deed of Trust the California Court  
28 of Appeals has recently thrown out much of the authority cited by the

1 Defendant and relied upon by the lower Court, and concluded that a borrower  
2 can in fact challenge the improper and untimely attempt to deposit an asset into  
3 a REMIC trust after the trust was closed to accept such an asset. (See: *Glaski v.*  
4 *Bank of America*, F064556, 2013 WL 4037310 (Cal. App. 5th Dist. 2013)

5  
6 **b. Standard of Review**

7 A dismissal without leave to amend is reviewed *de novo*. See *Smith v.*  
8 *Pacific Props. & Dev. Corp.*, 358 F.3d 1097, 1100 (9th Cir. 2004) (noting  
9 underlying legal determinations require *de novo* review); *Oki Semiconductor*  
10 *Co. v. Wells Fargo Bank*, 298 F.3d 768, 772 (9th Cir. 2002).

11 Dismissal without leave to amend is improper unless it is clear, upon *de*  
12 *novo* review that the complaint could not be saved by any amendment. See *AE*  
13 *ex rel. Hernandez v. County of Tulare*, 666 F.3d 631, 636 (9th Cir. 2012);  
14 *Jewel v. Nat'l Sec. Agency*, 673 F.3d 902, 903 n.3 (9th Cir. 2011); *Thinket Ink*  
15 *Info Res., Inc. v. Sun Microsystems, Inc.*, 368 F.3d 1053, 1061 (9th Cir. 2004).

16  
17 **VII. CONCLUSION.**

18  
19 HUNT files this appeal and respectfully asserts that upon *de novo* review  
20 of this case that the Court below erred in dismissing his cause of action without  
21 leave to amend. HUNT therefore requests that her appeal be granted, the Order  
22 of the District Court be rescinded and set aside, and that this Court order that  
23 HUNT be allowed to file a further amended Complaint.

24  
25 Date: October 22, 2013

26  
27 /s/ Joseph La Costa

28 \_\_\_\_\_  
Joseph La Costa, Attorney for Plaintiffs/Appellants

**STATEMENT OF RELATED CASES**

Pursuant to Ninth Circuit Rule 28-2.6, counsel for Plaintiff/Appellant hereby notifies the Court of the following related cases:

- 1) Federal District Court, Central District: ED CV 12-02171-TJH OPx
- 2) Federal District Court, Central District, ED CV 12-01075-VAP OPx

Respectfully submitted.

Dated this: October 22, 2013

/s/ Joseph La Costa

-----  
Joseph La Costa  
Attorney for Plaintiffs and Appellants

**Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure Form 6. Certificate of Compliance With Rule 32(a)**

Certificate of Compliance With Type-Volume Limitation,  
Typeface Requirements and Type Style Requirements

1. This brief complies with the type-volume limitation of Fed.R. App. P.32(a)(7)(B) because:



this brief contains 2144 words, excluding the parts of the brief exempted by Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(7)(B)(iii), *or*



this brief uses a monospaced typeface and contains [state the number of] lines of text , excluding the parts of the brief exempted by Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(7)(B)(iii).

2. This brief complies with the typeface requirements of Fed.R. App. P. 32(a)(5) and the type style requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(6) because:



this brief has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using [ Microsoft WORD 2007/Adobe Acrobat 9.0 ] in [ Font 14; Times New Roman Style ], *or*



this brief has been prepared in a monospaced typeface using [ state name and version of word processing program ] with [ state number of characters per inch and name of type style ].

(s) Joseph La Costa

Attorney for Plaintiff/Appellant

Dated: 10/22/2013



9th Circuit Case Number(s)

**NOTE:** To secure your input, you should print the filled-in form to PDF (File > Print > *PDF Printer/Creator*).

\*\*\*\*\*

### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

When All Case Participants are Registered for the Appellate CM/ECF System

I hereby certify that I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court for the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit by using the appellate CM/ECF system

on (date)  .

I certify that all participants in the case are registered CM/ECF users and that service will be accomplished by the appellate CM/ECF system.

Signature (use "s/" format)

\*\*\*\*\*

### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

When Not All Case Participants are Registered for the Appellate CM/ECF System

I hereby certify that I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court for the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit by using the appellate CM/ECF system

on (date)

Participants in the case who are registered CM/ECF users will be served by the appellate CM/ECF system.

I further certify that some of the participants in the case are not registered CM/ECF users. I have mailed the foregoing document by First-Class Mail, postage prepaid, or have dispatched it to a third party commercial carrier for delivery within 3 calendar days to the following non-CM/ECF participants:

Signature (use "s/" format)